one cannot escape the fact that the various societies and peoples of the Soviet Union are being reshaped and remolded with the image of Soviet culture as the target. The political life is that of Moscow's creation, as is the economic; the religious is that which is permitted by the central regime. The language of each nationality—as it is taught in the schools, or written in the newspapers—is the one which Moscow has decided upon. The various nationalities themselves have been regrouped, often arbitrarily, for the purpose of greater convenience of administration by Moscow.

The grandiose and sweeping nature of the changes planned under Soviet nationality policy is sufficient to assure that major change is in fact taking place. A question exists only in regard to the direction such change will take and how far it will deviate from the plan. Whatever the direction of change, the cost in dislocation and suffering among the minority peoples will remain enormous.

KAZAKH ART AND LETTERS

In the chapter dealing with Kazakh religion and religious developments, a discussion of current trends in history writing in Central Asia was included to illustrate the rise of nativism, the idealization of native culture. While the connection between historiography and religion is not immediately apparent, there is an underlying relationship. This relationship may be more easily traced when one is applying the methods of cultural anthropology, as was the case in the discussion of religion. If one starts with the premise that the various aspects of a people's life are an interrelated whole, it follows that the religious life bears upon the economic, the economic on the religious, the political on the artistic. The concept of nativism has been used as a means of synthesizing the different cultural trends in Kazakhstan. The significance of the glorification of their past by native Kazakh historians during the Soviet era is clear. The historical traditions of the Kazakhs are important to them; around those traditions they were building in the 1940's the nucleus of an independent revival of Kazakh culture. The Soviets regarded this as dangerous, and the participants were either purged or warned away from the theme.

This sort of cultural revival is a type of nativism known in many parts of the world; the common feature such revivals share is a distinctive religious tone. But it is not the old religion which is being revived among the Kazakhs; rather, the old traditions are being treated in a religious fashion. These traditions become a religion, and the renewed interest in them a religious revival. The movement among the Kazakhs to revive the traditions of the past immediately became involved in politics. The Russian term kultura usually implies such

ical ramifications. In this sense there is a cultural politics in
oviet Union.
The cultural taste of the regime in Moscow serves as a model for
rest of the empire. This cultural taste includes in part that which
easing to the political leaders of the Soviet Union. It includes

53
177
[341] also what Moscow deems proper to see developing in the provinces. The architecture which is encouraged in Moscow is only part of the climate of cultural taste. Public buildings in Alma-Ata reflect both Russian 19th century Baroque and Central Asiatic architectural themes: Russian columns and massiveness, Central Asiatic arches and blue tile ornament. Soviet architects have taken basic ideas from Russian contemporary architecture and to them added local ideas. Whether these hybrids are suited to local conditions of weather, availability of materials, and so forth, is another matter.

"Nationalist in form, socialist in content" was a much-publicized slogan 20 years ago; but it is seldom mentioned today. One can easily discuss Soviet art or architecture without reference to this formula; it no longer has even a covert role to play. The modern slogan might read "Soviet in basic form, local style in ornament."

668 This trend is evident in other forms of expression as well. Let us consider the topic of heroes. In the historical tradition, the Kazakh revival was centered around heroes of the past such as Kenesary Kasymov. This is not in keeping with the sense of heroism which the Kremlin seeks to instill in the Kazakhs. During the 1920's and 1930's, Moscow permitted only such heroes as Frunze and Chapayev, who fought the civil war in the steppes of Central Asia. To these has been added the figure of Amangeldy, a Kazakh who was an early member of the Bolshevik party. The revival of 19th century Kazakh heroes in the 1940's took place under conditions of wartime desperation. Moscow was anxious to sound any note that might awaken the feelings of the Kazakhs, to let any theme be pursued. The Soviets sought to show that the Russian revolutionaries in fighting the Tsars had advanced the same cause as had Kenesary, and that the Kazakhs and the Bolsheviks should therefore make common cause.

During World War II the possible selection of heroes expanded to include not only military and political leaders of the past, but literary
[538] and scientific figures as well. Abai Kunanbaev, a 19th century Kazakh poet, has been much publicized in novels, plays, movies, and literary essays. He is acceptable to the Russians, for he was the translator into Kazakh of Russian poetry. Moreover, he was a friend of anti-Tsarist Russians, among them Chernyshevsky, a novelist and revolutionary exile. Chokan Valikhanov, although a Kazakh, was an officer of the Tsars, educated in St. Petersburg University, a member of
[814] leading artistic and intellectual circles, and author of historical and ethnographic notes on the Kazakh past. He has been no less honored than Abai or Kenesary. Altynsarin, perhaps the greatest Kazakh intellectual, an educator, publicist, editor, ethnographer, and creator of a Kazakh alphabet, was likewise given a pre-eminent place in the Kazakh revival.

[214] In the 1940's a Kazakh literary and artistic journal Adabiet zhane
[538] iskusstvo ("Literature and Art") was started. Adabiet is a Kazakh word meaning literature, iskusstvo a Russian word meaning art; the title thus expresses the mixed character of contemporary Kazakh arts and literature. It can hardly be said that the journal is a success. It has been attacked for deviations from the political line, as might have been

538
197

form's sake, and above all, no subjectivism or nonobjectivism, so characteristic of recent western European art. And literature is to pursue socialist realism, that is, the objective expression of Soviet themes. In a word, art in the service of the state. The themes of Kazakh novels are typical Soviet themes: industrialization, as in the novel Life and Death by Mustafin; youth and the Soviet innovator or new Soviet man, as in Abishev's Young Generation and Mustafin's Shiganak; the Sovietization of rural life, as in Mukanov's Syr Darya and Mustafin's Millionaire. Mustafin and Mukanov have been officially praised for depicting the educative force of collective labor.[1] And Mukanov, Auezov, and Mustafin have been jointly praised for achieving professional stature as novelists, disclosing "their fruitful instruction by the Russian and Soviet literary classics in the method of Socialist realism in Kazakh prose."[2]

But the best works are those which deal with the past, such as Auezov's fictional biography of Abai and Mukanov's memoirs of his own prerevolutionary days, "My Schooling." These have been condemned because they contain glorifications of the past; they insist that all was not wrong in those times. The heroes of the new novels see their personal happiness in the weal of the Soviet fatherland; they think not only of immediate issues, such as their own collective farms, but of Moscow, Stalin, Leningrad, the Volga, and Stalingrad. They celebrate the Volga, Mother River of Russia.[3] But artistically, the new novels are less satisfying.

Auezov's novels about Abai are rich in their description of the Kazakh landscape, rich in language, but they are criticized for glorifying the "feudal-patriarchal" life of the past; they exalt past leaders and overlook Abai's fight against Pan-Islamism and Pan-Turkism.[4]

546

During the war, the Kazakh film industry received a tremendous lift when the Moscow studios moved to Alma-Ata. This growth was short-lived, however, for the studios were moved back to Moscow after the war. A Soviet controversy arose about one of the few films made in Alma-Ata, a film on the life of Chokan Valikhanov. While the idea of filming the life of this historic figure was praised in the Party press, the film itself was sharply criticized. The reasons given for the criticism are highly instructive: The film does not show the influence on Valikhanov of Russian revolutionaries; it idealizes Pan-Islamists of the 1860's and 1870's; it revives the ideals of the Alash-Orda (free nomads as of yore—no cities, no schools, no science); it praises Kenesary; it fails to show how Valikhanov's father supported the union of Kazakhstan with Russia; it distorts the latter's role by claiming that he sought to disaffect from Russia.[5]

53
197

Kazakh literature and art are not nationalist in form and socialist in content. In the design of public buildings, in the various fields of writing, in the making of films, the content is designated by Moscow.

[1] Malinovskii, 1949, p. 43.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 41.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 48
[4] *Kazakhstanskaia Pravda*, 6 Sep 53.
[5] *Ibid.*, 23 Oct 52.

53 177

The form is also imposed by Moscow, whether it concerns the introduction of the novel form in literature or the imitation of the massive architectural style in public buildings. Only the ornament and embellishment are locally derived.

HISTORY

668 [814]

The same lines of criticism which the Soviets have directed at Kazakh literature and art have been applied to the writing of Kazakh history. The revival of Kazakh historical traditions during World War II developed into a great movement involving many Kazakh historians and writers. In 1950, Pravda published an editorial denouncing the entire movement, choosing for its main target the luckless Bekmakhanov, for his history of the Kenesary movement.[1] The Kazakh Party and press were slow in following the line laid down in Pravda. Only after a four-month delay did Kazakhstanskaia Pravda take up the attack, printing a policy statement from the Central Committee of the Kazakh Party, which commented on the Pravda editorial of the previous December and called for a formal Party hearing on the subject. This hearing took place in April and was reported in Kazakhstanskaia Pravda of 24 April 1951, in an article giving the general Party findings and those of the Party primary organization of the Kazakh Pedagogic Institute. Kenesary was denounced at one meeting as "an enemy of the Kazakh toiling masses" by 11 speakers representing the Party leaders and the academic world. The attack was directed at others: school textbook authors Ismailov and Dzhumaliev, both professors of history; Sauranbaev, director of the Social Science Section of the Academy of Sciences; and one Adilgireev, all in addition to Bekmakhanov. But this was only the beginning.

The attack on Kazakh revivalism continued, centered around the figure of Kenesary, with a different series of authors subjected to the sternest criticism. The line now advanced by Pravda, the Party press of Kazakhstan, and the History Section of the Academy of Sciences, was that there were two kinds of leaders in Central Asia in the 18th and 19th centuries—good leaders and bad. The Kazakh leader Kenesary was bad; he was called a class enemy, a reactionary feudal lord. Other Kazakh leaders were classified as good, for they sought to lead their peoples into an alliance with the oppressed Russian masses, seeking a common solution for their jointly shared troubles. The Kazakh leader Isatai Taimanov, for example, revolted not against the Tsar but against Russian capitalists who were exploiting his people.[2] This indicates, the Soviets conclude, that the Tsars had parallel interests with the poor Russians, while the enemies of both the poor Russians and the poor Kazakhs were the Russian capitalists.

The central Soviet historical journal, Voprosy Istorii ("Questions of History"), published in April 1951 a lead editorial, "On Certain

[1] *Pravda*, 26 Dec 50.
[2] *Kazakhstanskaia Pravda*, 19 Apr 51.